<u>REMARKS</u>

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 21, 2007. Claims 13-23 are presented for examination, of which Claims 13 and 18 are in independent form. Claims 13 and 18 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Claims 14-17 and 19-23 have been amended as to matters of form only, and/or correct claim dependency. No change in scope is either intended or believed effected by at least these latter changes. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 14-17 and 19-23 were objected to because they depend from canceled claims. Applicant has carefully reviewed and amended Claims 14-17 to depend from Claim 13; Claims 19, 20, 22 and 23 to depend from Claim 18; and Claim 21 to depend from Claim 20. It is believed that the objection to the claims based on improper dependency has been overcome and its withdrawal is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Claim 23 has been rejected under the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Office Action states that the "specification does not mention that the control program stored on a computer readable medium" and that "the specification does not define what are the computer readable medium. In addition, Claim 23 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant has carefully reviewed and amended Claim 23 to replace "control program stored a computer readable medium" with --a computer-readable medium storing a control program--. Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 23, when read (as the law requires that they be read) in light of the specification, is sufficiently clear such that one of ordinary skill in the relevant art would understand with the legally-required degree of certainty the scope of these

8

claims. The computer-readable medium storing a computer program of Claim 23 is clearly

described on at least pages 27-30. It is believed that the rejections under Section 112 have been

obviated, and their withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 23 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 on the ground that

the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Without conceding the

correctness of this rejection, Applicant has amended Claim 23 along the lines discussed above. It

is believed that the rejection under Section 101 has been obviated, and its withdrawal is therefore

respectfully requested.

Claims 13-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated

by U.S. Patent No. 6,957,276 (Bahl).

As shown above, Applicant has amended independent Claims 13 and 18 in

terms that more clearly define what he regards as his invention. Applicant submits that these

amended independent claims, together with the remaining claims dependent thereon, are

patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

Claim 13 is directed to an information processing apparatus which can

communicate via a network with an external information processing apparatus which issues a

disconnection notification based on disconnection from the network. The information processing

apparatus includes: (1) managing means for managing fixed identification information added to

the external information processing apparatus and variable identification information added to

the external information processing apparatus; (2) obtaining means for obtaining the fixed

identification information and the variable identification information from the external

information processing apparatus; (3) discriminating means for discriminating whether the

variable identification information obtained by the obtaining means coincides with the variable identification information managed by the managing means and whether the fixed identification information obtained by the obtaining means coincides with the fixed identification information managed by the managing means; and (4) searching means for performing a search request for the external information processing apparatus in order to update a configuration in the information processing apparatus if the discriminating means determines that, although the variable identification information obtained by the obtaining means coincides with the variable identification information managed by the managing means, the fixed identification information obtained by the obtaining means does not coincide with the fixed identification information managed by the managing means.

The present invention as recited in Claim 13 is directed to a client apparatus having a discovery protocol, such as UPnP or WSD,[1] whereas Bahl, in contrast, relates to problems caused in address assignment processing performed by a DHCP server.

In the UPnP or WSD, each network device notifies every client apparatus on the network of its address (IP address) when it is connected to the network for the first time, and the client apparatus stores the address for communication with the network device. The IP address, however, may in some cases be assigned to another network device, after some time has elapsed, e.g., when the network device previously using the IP address is turned off-line. Bahl does not even recognize this problem.

The structure recited in Claim 13 provides a solution to the above problem by

---

[1] It is to be understood, of course, that the claim scope is not limited by the details of the described embodiments, which are referred to only to facilitate explanation.

discriminating whether the variable identification information (IP address) obtained by the

obtaining means coincides with the variable identification information managed by the managing

means and whether the fixed identification information obtained by the obtaining means

coincides with the fixed identification information managed by the managing means. The client

apparatus can determine that the IP address has been assigned to a new network device in

response to the discrimination that the variable identification information (IP address) is identical

but the fixed identification information is not identical. In that case, the searching means

performs a search request for the external information processing apparatus (network device) in

order to update a configuration in the information processing apparatus (update network setting

in the client apparatus).

In contrast, Bahl relates to a system and method for allowing a network

administrator to assign, remove and reclaim static addresses through a centralized DHCP server.

Applicant has found nothing in Bahl that would teach or suggest "managing means for managing

fixed identification information added to the external information processing apparatus and

variable identification information added to the external information processing apparatus,"

"obtaining means for obtaining the fixed identification information and the variable identification

information from the external information processing apparatus," "discriminating means for

discriminating whether the variable identification information obtained by said obtaining means

coincides with the variable identification information managed by said managing means and

whether the fixed identification information obtained by said obtaining means coincides with the

fixed identification information managed by said managing means" or "searching means for

performing a search request for the external information processing apparatus in order to update a

configuration in said information processing apparatus if said discriminating means determines

that, although the variable identification information obtained by said obtaining means coincides

with the variable identification information managed by said managing means, the fixed

identification information obtained by said obtaining means does not coincide with the fixed

identification information managed by said managing means," as recited in Claim 13.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 13 is not anticipated by Bahl.

The Office Action broadly cites columns 1-4 of Bahl as disclosing these

features. As discussed above, however, Bahl has nothing to do with the present invention, and

Applicant has found nothing in columns 1-4, nor anywhere else in Bahl, that would even hint of

the above recitations of Claim 13. Should the Examiner maintain her rejection, Applicant

respectfully requests that the Examiner specifically point out, by column and line number, where

each recitation is found in Bahl.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in

Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference

against Claim 13.

Independent Claim 18 is a method claim corresponding to apparatus Claim 13,

and is believed to be patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as discussed

above in connection with Claim 13.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of

the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same

reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the

invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits

is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jennifer A. Reda/
Jennifer A. Reda
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 57,840

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 1532649v1